

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria Viginia 22313-1450

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov	

APPLICATION NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/866,800 05/30/2001 Kazuhiko Okawa 109657 5674 25944 08/21/2003 7590 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC EXAMINER P.O. BOX 19928 MONDT, JOHANNES P ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2826

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			an
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/866,800	OKAWA ET AL.	
Advicery Nederi	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Johannes P Mondt	2826	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the ma	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. FR 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The appropriation of the final of the fi	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	S .
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			•
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7, 20-23 and 25-26</u> .	•		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	2/		
8.☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on // is,	(a) □ approved or b) □ disapp	roved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(ṣ)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>	
Other: NATHAN 6. FLY SUPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY CENT	EXVIII. 1611		



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Proposed Amendment does not place the application in better form for appeal, because the nomenclature addressed by it is not an issue in the rejections.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (1) the argument of traverse on page 3, third paragraph, argues the claim rejection on the basis of the specification rather than the claim language itself; (2) the argument of traverse on page 4 cannot be accepted because Natori discloses "source/drain regions" 9, hence clearly a lateral transistor.